

Appin No. 10/727238  
Amdt. Dated: December 15, 2006  
Response to Office Action of September 19, 2006

3

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
DEC 14 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of September 19, 2006 the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment to the claims and the below Remarks.

#### ***Regarding Amendment***

In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to specify that the processor is configured to control and trim the amount of power supplied to the input to predetermine a threshold at which operation of the integrated circuit is established and to clarify that this is the predetermined threshold used by the power detection unit. Support for these amendments can be found at in section 20.3 on pages 230-231 of the present specification; and dependent claims 2-5 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not add new matter to the present application.

#### ***Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-5 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by previously cited Muller in view of newly cited Schu et al. (US 5,973,968), for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 has been amended to specify that the predetermined threshold used by the power detection unit is predetermined by the processor. This is done by configuring the processor to control and trim the amount of power supplied so as to determine the power point at which operation of the integrated circuit is established (see section 20.3 on pages 230-231 of the present specification).

On the other hand, Muller is silent as to the manner in which the predetermined level below which the voltage drops is determined for use by the power monitor 52 to have the erase/write protection circuit control read and write functions to the memory unit 38 (see col. 9, lines 28-57). Further, Schu merely discloses use of a power-on-reset strategy and, like Muller, is silent as to the determination of a predetermined power threshold.

Thus, whether taken alone or in combination, Muller and Schu do not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-5 dependent therefrom.

Appln No. 10/727238

Amdt. Dated: December 15, 2006


Response to Office Action of September 19, 2006

4

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary Shipton

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762